REMARKS

Claims 3, 4 and 7-10 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 4 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourdol (U.S. Patent 5,594,810) in view of Ishigaki (U.S. Patent 5,361,310).

Regarding the rejections of independent Claims 3, 7 and 9 under §103(a), the Examiner states that Gourdol in view of Ishigaki renders unpatentable all of the elements of the claims. Gourdol teaches a method and apparatus for recognizing gestures on a computer system; Ishigaki teaches a handwriting entry processing system using keyboard and mouse interfaces requiring no modification of an application program.

The claims of the present application disclose performing character recognition of recorded touch screen data at the completion of the touch screen data record process generated according to each stroke, and performing character recognition of touch screen data recorded at the completion of a predetermined waiting threshold time period so that character recognition can be performed more quickly than compared to the conventional methods, such as those taught by Gourdol or Ishigaki.

According to Gourdol, if a user does not input a gesture similar to one of predetermined gestures, the input gesture cannot be recognized. Accordingly, a stroke is determined as part of a multiple stroke gesture by checking if an additional stroke is entered within a predetermined distance of the first received stroke and within a predetermined period of time following the entry of the first stoke in order to accurately recognize the input handwriting (see col. 14, line 62 to col. 15, line 23). In other words, according to Gourdol, if there is an additional stroke after the entry of the first stroke, the device determines if the strokes entered on a screen are strokes forming a multiple stroke gesture. Therefore, referring to the detailed description of FIG. 11 (see col. 14, line 62 to col. 15, line 23 of Gourdol), a CPU determines if a stroke entered on a screen is part of a multiple stroke gesture in step

-2-

220, normalizes the stroke in step 86', compares the stroke to a list of gesture prototypes in step 88' and identifies a gesture from the list of gesture prototypes that best matches the normalized stroke in step 90'. That is, Gourdol discloses using a predetermined distance and a predetermined period of time only for determining if an additional stroke after the entry of the first stroke is related to the first stroke or not.

Accordingly, neither Gourdol nor Ishigaki disclose recognizing a character according to entry of each stroke. Also, Gourdol does NOT recognize a gesture at the entry of every stroke, but simply checks whether an input stroke is a part of a multiple stroke gesture.

Furthermore, although Gourdol is combined with Ishigaki, if no stroke entered for a predetermine waiting threshold time after the entry of all of the strokes, the strokes are determined as one gesture, as shown in FIG. 4 of the present application that also describes the conventional method. Hence, it is necessary to consider the total period of the record time, the waiting time and the recognition time for recognition. The conventional recognition methods, as well as Gourdol and Ishigaki require this extended time period to process the input strokes. Claim 3 of the present application recites "wherein the character recognition and the counting of the threshold time occur simultaneously", the counting of the threshold timer is performed at the same time of recognizing a stroke. Thus, if there are multiple strokes for one character, character recognition occurs at the same time of entering one stroke according to Claim 3, whereas it takes an extended time to complete one character before the recognition according to Gourdol and Ishigaki.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 3, 7 and 9 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 3, 7 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4, 8 and 10 these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on its respective amended independent

claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent Claims 4, 8 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 3, 4 and 7-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr

-4-